

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are all the claims pending in the present application. It appears that the Examiner has withdrawn the previous prior art rejections of claims 1-19 and 21 because the Examiner only addresses claim 20 in the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action and does not indicate that claims 1-19 and 21 are rejected over the previously applied references.<sup>1</sup> The Examiner, however, adds a new rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.<sup>2</sup> Claim 20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Yabuki (US Patent No. 5,796,351).<sup>3</sup>

**§112, first paragraph Rejections - Claims 1-18**

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the present Office Action.

With respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 18, in the previous Amendment, Applicant added the feature that a connection is automatically initiated when a wireless terminal enters a service region. In response, the Examiner alleges that this new feature constitutes new matter that was not properly described in and supported by the application as filed. In response, Applicant submits that support for the above-mentioned feature can be found on page 5, lines 4-25 of the present application, at least implicitly. That is, the present specification indicates that

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner confirm that the prior art rejections of claims 1-19 and 21 have, in fact, been withdrawn.

<sup>2</sup> The Office Action only indicates that claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, however we believe that the Examiner intended to indicate that claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as claim 19 depends from claim 18.

<sup>3</sup> The Examiner does not address claim 21, therefore we believe that this claim contains allowable subject matter.

an Inquiry (*see page 5, lines 9-10*) is performed by a master device, e.g., the wireless connection devices 30,40, in an effort to establish communication with a slave device, e.g., a wireless terminal 3. Such communication cannot be established until the wireless terminal 3 is in a same region as a wireless connection device. Once a wireless terminal is in a service area of a wireless connection device, then the wireless terminal 3 can receive the Inquiry from the wireless connection device, and can return an Inquiry Scan (*see page 5, lines 11-12*) as an operation in the establishing of the communication between the wireless terminal and the wireless connection device. Therefore, at least based on that which is set forth in the above cited portions of the specification, Applicant submits that the features added in the previous Amendment do not constitute new matter as a communication is automatically initiated once a wireless terminal enters a service region in which it can receive the Inquiry. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejections of independent claims 1, 9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be removed. The rejections of dependent claims 2-8 and 10-17 should be withdrawn at least based on the reasons set forth above.

*§102(a) Rejections (Yabuki) - Claim 20*

Based on the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action, it appears that the Examiner only maintains the prior art rejection of claim 20. In the previous Amendment, Applicant argued that Yabuki does not teach or suggest at least, “receiving an initial screen from the wireless connection device in order to read the exhibition information, “ as recited in claim 20. *See page 12 of Amendment dated December 17, 2004.* In response, the Examiner simply directs Applicant’s attention to the general control unit 10 and terminal 40 shown in Fig. 1 of Yabuki, however the Examiner does not demonstrate that the specific above-quoted feature is satisfied in Yabuki. Neither Fig. 1 nor the corresponding text addresses the feature of receiving


an initial screen from the wireless connection device in order to read the exhibition information. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant maintains that independent claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over Yabuki.<sup>4</sup>

Since the Examiner does not address the previously presented prior art rejections of claims 1-19 and 21, Applicant believes that only claim 20 is rejected over prior art. Applicant submits that it is believed that the prior art rejections of claims 1-19 and 21 have been withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 7, 2005

---

<sup>4</sup> The Examiner does not address claim 21, therefore we believe that this claim is allowable.